

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

I am deeply concerned about the decreasing quality of media programming available to me. I remember when "60 Minutes" used to be a real news show. Now I question their journalistic integrity, and the integrity of many other media outlets, because of increasing corporate consolidation. As you remember, there was a story on "60 Minutes" which was critical of certain of Disney's business practices. Because Disney now owns ABC, that story was cancelled or weakened considerably. Consolidation has had a chilling effect on investigative journalism. I shudder to imagine what further consolidation BETWEEN media corporations will bring. I strongly urge the FCC to not release the few restrictions that do exist in the realm of corporate media consolidation. Viewpoint diversity means seeking out several different viewpoints on an issue. As Congressional Democrats and Republicans become more similar on their viewpoints about important political issues (e.g., federal tax breaks, the necessity of going to war with Iraq), it is very important for the American people to be presented with viewpoints that are out of the "mainstream." What are the arguments for NOT going to war with Iraq? What are the arguments for campaign money reform? If we were to merely rely on the viewpoints of the vast majority of Congressional politicians (who represent the mainstream of American society), we would never hear about important viewpoints opposing those policies. The Vietnam War would not have ended without media exposure to viewpoints out of the mainstream that were not (in 1970) commercially competitive.